

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 remain in the application for consideration of the Examiner.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and objections are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and following remarks.

Turning now to the art rejections, Claims 1-4, 7-8, 9-13, 15-17, and 18-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Schulhof; and Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schulhof in view of Olden.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Schulhof does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the gain adjuster operable to adjust the *ith* sub-band of the adaptive graphic equalizer in response to the difference in the *ith* sub-band of the filter output signal from the plurality of first filters and from the *ith* sub-band of the filtered auto signal from the plurality of second filters as defined in independent Claim 1, albeit defined as the step of adjusting the gain of the *ith* equalizing filter of a adaptive graphic equalizer in response to the difference between the *ith* filter sub-band of the audio and output signals as defined in independent Claim 9.

The Examiner alleges that Schulhof discloses a response to the difference between the *ith* filter sub-band of the audio and output signals.

However, notwithstanding the comments of the Examiner, there is nothing in Schulhof to disclose a difference.

Furthermore, Schulhof discloses at column 2, lines 45-55 that the equalizing circuit 10 adjusts the tonal of the first electrical audio frequency signal from the preamplifier 4.

There is nothing to indicate that the output of the equalizer 10 is based upon the *i*th sub-band of the filtered output signal from the plurality of second filters.

Element 5 of Schulhof is an amplifier.

Odlen does not disclose or suggest the presently claimed invention including the gain adjuster operable to adjust the *i*th sub-band of the adaptive graphic equalizer in response to a difference in the first sub-band of the filtered output signal from the plurality of first filters and the *i*th sub-band of the filtered audio signal from the plurality of second filters in the various forms in independent Claims 1 and 9.

Odlen is silent to these features.

Applicants appreciate the indication that Claims 5 and 14 if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims would be allowable.

By the instant amendment, Claims 5 and 14 have been placed in independent form including the limitations of Claims 1 and 9 respectively.

It is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-22 patentably define over the applied art.

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

While it is believed that the instant response places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to the deposit account of Texas Instruments Incorporated, Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,



W. Daniel Swayze, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,478

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-5633